UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,300	02/22/2002	Thomas Schaeck	RSW920010213US1	3842

7590   08/02/2005

Jeanine S. Ray-Yarletts
IBM Corporation T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER
KOROBOV, VITALI A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/081,300	SCHAECK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Vitali Korobov	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 February 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *22 February 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2/22/2002*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This is a first Office Action on the merits of this application. Claims 1-13 are presented for examination.

Paper Submitted

2.   It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file: **Information Disclosure Statement** as received on 02/22/02 was considered.

Specification

3.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The attempt to incorporate subject matter into this application by reference to U. S. Patents is ineffective because referenced applications are not U. S. Patents.

Further, the disclosure is objected to because it contains embedded hyperlinks and/or other forms of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form

the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1-3, 11, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by U. S. Patent Publication 2001/0009016 by Hofmann et al. (hereinafter

Hofmann).

Regarding claim 1, Hofmann teaches a method of providing role-specific views of

an aggregated service in a computing network, the aggregated service comprising one

or more software resources, the method comprising steps of: providing a role-specific

portlet for each role supported by a particular one of the one or more software

resources (Fig. 3, role-specific portlets 115, 116 and 117 for particular software

resources 101A, 101C and RDF data, respectively); providing linkage between the role-

specific portlets and the roles for the particular one of the software resources (Fig. 3,

links between items 115 and 101A, 117 and 101C, and 116 and RDF data); repeating

the providing steps for each of the one or more software resources (Fig. 2B, "Yes" loop-

back from the decision box 289; see also §0094 – repeat of selection operation as

appropriate); obtaining, at run time, a user role corresponding to a user of the

aggregated service (§0061 – user role is determined as a result of his request (run time)

based of the user's demands or wishes); and using the obtained role to programmatically select a corresponding one of the role-specific portlets for each of the software resources, thereby providing the role-specific view of the aggregated service (Fig. 2B – process flow diagram of programmatic selection of role-specific portlets. See also §0088 for a detailed description of the process 280).

Regarding claim 2, Hofmann teaches the method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of rendering the selected role-specific view for the user (§0060 – presentation manager renders information to the user device).

Regarding claim 3, Hofmann teaches the method according to claim 1, where in the using step further comprises steps of: determining which of the one or more software resources should be invoked to position the user's entry point into the aggregated service (Fig. 2B – decision 286 – determination (selection) of a portlet (entry point into the aggregated service) based on the MIME type); and using the obtained role to programmatically select a role-specific view of the determined software resource (§0077 – selection of the mail service as an example of the role-specific view of the determined software resource).

Claims 11 and 12 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 1 and differ from said claim one only in statutory category. Claims 11 and 12 set forth the invention as a system and a computer-readable media, respectively, rather than a method, as does claim 1, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale as the above rejected claim 1.

Claim 13 does not teach or define any new limitations above those of claim 1-3,

and therefore is rejected for similar reasons as said claims 1-3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
> art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to
> a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Hofmann in view of the U. S. Patent 6,920,461 to Hejlsberg et al. (hereinafter

Hejlsberg).

Regarding claim 4, Hofmann teaches the method according to claim 1.

Hofmann does not explicitly teach the additional limitation of claim 4, wherein the

user role is stored in a user profile associated with the user.

Hejlsberg teaches the additional limitation of claim 4, wherein the user role is

stored in a user profile associated with the user (Col. 8, lines 5-9 – role based

authentication).

Hofmann and Hejlsberg are analogous art because they are both related to

providing web services. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hofmann

and Hejlsberg in order to further facilitate the shift to the distributed computing

environment (Hejlsberg, Col. 2, lines 22 – 32)

Regarding claim 5, the Hofmann/Hejlsberg combination teaches the method

according to claim 1, wherein the user role is determined using the user's identification

and credentials (Hejlsberg, Col. 8, lines 5-9 – role based authentication).

Regarding claim 6, the Hofmann/Hejlsberg combination teaches the method

according to claim 1, wherein user role information is programmatically relayed among

distributed services performed by the software resources of the aggregated service

(Hejlsberg, Col. 5, lines 66-67, and Col. 6, lines 1-9 – security, authentication and

verification in accessing services).

Regarding claim 7, the Hofmann/Hejlsberg combination teaches the method

according to claim 6, wherein the programmatic relaying comprises sending a message

which specifies the user role in a header of the message and in which a body of the

message identifies that this message is delivering the user role (Hejlsberg, Col. 3, lines

40-44 – remote calls and SOAP/XML invocations. The limitations of claim 6 are met by

the format of SOAP message header and SOAP envelope).

Regarding claim 8, the Hofmann/Hejlsberg combination teaches the method

according to claim 7, wherein the message is a SOAP ("Simple Object Access

Protocol") message (Hejlsberg, Col. 3, lines 40-44 – remote calls and SOAP/XML

invocations).

Regarding claim 9, the Hofmann/Hejlsberg combination teaches the method

according to claim 1, wherein the linkage uses XML Linking language ("XLink") syntax

(Hofmann, §0072 – XML).

Regarding claim 10, the Hofmann/Hejlsberg combination teaches the method

according to claim 1, wherein the linkage is stored in a portlet archive ("PAR") file

(Hofmann, §0025 – storage).

6.   **Examiner's note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line
numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the
applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art
and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and
figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing
responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part
of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art
or disclosed by the Examiner.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection

of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art

disclosed by the references cited and the objection made. Applicant must show how the

amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR § 1.111(c).

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Vitali Korobov whose telephone number is 571-272-

7506. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday 8a.m. - 4:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571)272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Vitali Korobov
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

07/27/2005
VAK

SALEH NAJJAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER